Mr. K. RAMANNA.—The Chief Justice is appointed by His Highness the Maharaja. Can the members of the House discuss such appointments on the floor of the House?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—I am also trying to impress that aspect of the question on the members. The original question was quite unobjectionable. But supplementary questions are being asked without any regard as to where the line of demarcation has to be drawn.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—I am only asking about the provision made in the budget.

The MINISTER for REVENUE and FINANCE (Rajamantrapravina K. V. Anantaraman.)—The Comptroller provides amounts on the basis of orders existing at the time. The term of the present officer was to include two months of the new year and so he provided Rs. 2,500 for that period. For the rest of the year, he provided at Rs. 2,000 because he was not aware that the services of the officer would be extended.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—Did the Comptroller know that the future incumbent in office would get only Rs. 2,000?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Yes, because that is the sanctioned pay of the post.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—Supposing the war had not broken out, would not the officer himself have asked for retirement?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—That is more than I can say.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—Is it not a fact that because of the prevailing war conditions he cannot return to his country and could that be the reason for extending his services?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—That is not a proper question to ask.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—Has he not said in one of the judgments that "Truth is only a catch-word in this country" and thus cast an aspersion on the nation as a whole?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—That question is distinctly irrelevant and not permissible.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA.—Is there any rule or convention that the Chief Justice of the State should always be an European?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—No.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA.—Is there any pressure from higher authorities that an European Chief Justice should be appointed?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—No.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA.—Have representations been made to the Imperial Government that this should be a condition precedent to the retrocession of the Civil and Military Station, Bangalore?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Notice.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA.—Will the Government be good enough to make the information available to this House before the close of the session?

Mr. B T. KESAVAIENGAR.—If the question comes up again in any connection, we shall let you know.

Mr. Isthuri SAMPANGI RAMIAH.—Is it a fact that after this officer was appointed, a large number of pending cases were disposed of and the disposal of the current cases has been expedited?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Yes, and that is why he is continuing.

Mr. S. C. MALLIAH.—Is it not a fact that this officer's term has been extended, as in a few other cases, in the interest of public service and not on any personal considerations?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Yes.

Mr. K. VENKATARAMIAH.—Has it come to the notice of the Government that as regards speedy disposal of cases the Mysore High Court stands first in the whole of India?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—No.

Mr. C. RAMASWAMY CHETTY.—How is it that our Government are so fond of giving extensions to foreigners in service while the same consideration is not shown to officers who are sons of the soil?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—(No answer).

SPECIAL REPRESENTATION.

Necessity to control Prices of Yarn and Cloth.

At this stage **the PRESIDENT** informed the House that he had received

a requisition signed by 58 members of the Assembly to the effect that they be allowed to move an adjournment motion or an emergency resolution for discussing the necessity of controlling the prices of yarn in the State, either by legislation or by the application of the Defence of India Act in consideration of the prices of yarn and cloth having increased up to 250 per cent of the previous rates and resulted in hardship to consumers of yarn and cloth. He stated that the requisition could not be regarded as a notice of adjournment motion under the rules, but under the powers vested in him as President of the Assembly, he would however have no objection to admit it as a Special Representation and allot some time on the following day for a discussion of the subject-matter in question.

Mr. Shampoor PAPANNA, who was one of the signatories to the requisition, represented that if this was treated as a representation, perhaps only one member might have the opportunity of raising the question. Whereas if it was treated as a special resolution, in view of the interest attaching to the question, more members could have the opportunity of discussing it.

Mr. PRESIDENT stated that it was with a view to enabling at least some members to participate in the discussion he had proposed to admit the representation as a special representation and to allot some time for its discussion.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS—BILLS—*contd.*

17. The Mysore Motor Vehicles Bill.

The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, LAW DEPARTMENT (Mr. H. V. Narayana Rao) explained the principles of the Bill as follows :—

The Mysore Motor Vehicles Act, 1928, modelled on the corresponding Act of British India, the Indian Motor Vehicles Act, 1914, is the law governing the grant of driving licences and registration of motor vehicles in Mysore.

In British India it was recognised that the law as found in the 1914 Act was no longer adequate to deal with conditions brought about by the rapid growth of motor transport. In the interests alike of the safety and convenience of the public and of the development of a co-ordinated system of transport, much closer control was considered necessary. A number of experts and committees set up by the Government of India made recommendations for a change in the law. In 1936, therefore, a Bill to amend the 1914 Act was introduced in British India and circulated for public opinion. In the meanwhile, two other reports were received by the Government of India and in the result, a comprehensive measure was brought forward in 1938 and passed into law in 1939. This Act of 1939 is the basis of the present Bill.

Such a measure is considered necessary not only to secure uniformity in the law but also to provide for reciprocity so that vehicles and drivers in Mysore may not be inconvenienced when travelling in British India and *vice versa*.

Many of the provisions in the Bill are at present being enforced in Mysore under the 1928 Act and the Road Traffic and Taxes Act and the rules thereunder.

But the Bill is more comprehensive in its provisions and a number of safeguards have been imposed on the issue of driving licences and control of transport vehicles and traffic on roads.

The principle of compulsory insurance is entirely new to Mysore, but in the interests of the safety of third parties who are often innocent victims of motor accidents in which they are not at fault, it has been considered desirable to incorporate such a principle in the Bill. The provisions will however not come into force immediately but after a certain period in order to enable these provisions to be made known to the public.

It is expected that the enactment of this Bill will tend to reduce the number of road accidents and secure a better and more efficient use of motor transport in Mysore.

Mr. T. M. KHAN submitted that this was a very important Bill with a very large number of clauses and schedules for study. There was not time enough